

**DRAFT**  
**DNCT Steering Committee**  
**Meeting Notes**  
**11/5/98**  
**10:00-12:00**

**Attendees:** Mike Thabault, Bruce Herbold, Elise Holland, Pete Chadwick, Pete Rhoads, Dave Fullerton(phone), Curtis Creel, Dave Briggs(phone), Peter Louie(phone), Sushil Arora, Tom Cannon, Art Hinojosa, Russ Brown, Dale Flowers, Ron Ott.

**Agenda:**

- i. Scenario review and development.
- ii. Finish scenario E
- iii. Look at Jim B's scenario
- iv. Guidance for DEFT in setting rules.
- v. Guidance for NoName Friday meeting.
- vi. Nov 12 to Management

**Highlights**

- I. Clarified scenarios and flushed out E.
- II. Defined DEFT and NNG assignments.

**Actions:**

- III. Buell will provide revised scenario in new format.
- IV. NNG will be prodded to get their support in evaluating scenarios.
- V. DEFT will discuss issues.
- VI. DEFT will develop rules for scenarios.

**Revised Scenario Descriptions - (see attached wordperfect file)**

**Scenario E:**

1. Pete R: Questioned including In-Delta AFRP.
2. Pete C: VAMP is a substitute for south Delta actions.
3. Pete R: VAMP deals with south Delta differently than Accord south Delta protections; the policy issues differ and are broader.
4. Mike T: Biological opinion changed some things. If you delete action #1, then you are back to Accord with Vernalis standard.
5. Pete R: proposed Accord + Upstream AFRP + some In-Delta AFRP actions - E/I standard.
6. Bruce: Purchased water could go into the EWA.
7. Pete R: Some stakeholders are concerned about making up Accord costs.
8. George: No Dip was relative to Accord + Upstream AFRP.

9. Dave: Dip refers to below Accord.
10. Bruce: We have two kinds of EWA water based on two points of delivery:
  - 1) outflow
  - 2) delivery to San Luis storage
11. Elise: As water year solidifies so does EWA water.
12. Pete C: relief from standards comes with reducing export losses
13. Mike T: there is a heightened risk because salvage is used as trigger.
14. Pete R: there is an overall issue of area of influence of pumps and subjection to indirect mortality - a difference in view of indirect mortality issue.
15. George: this is a water supply scenario - there shouldn't be a tradeoff issue.
16. Mike T/Pete C: all the scenarios have this issue.
17. Pete C: This scenario has less fish protection, thus the risks of using a salvage trigger is greater than in the other scenarios.
18. Mike T: the opportunity to maximize multiple species benefits becomes less when using a salvage trigger.
19. George: did not intend that this only be a salvage driven scenario. Dropping E/I will provide more bang for the buck.
20. Bruce: Scenario E provide a good contrast to A.

#### **Jim Buell Scenario**

21. Pete R: more emphasis on habitat. Will provide in new format. Stakeholders will be preparing more scenarios.
22. Elise: do we go ahead and try to put together such scenarios for other stakeholders and then air them out with our groups?
23. Mike T: any scenario that provides more water supply than the Accord will be DOA. Policy did not want us to provide that side.
24. Bruce: there is no need to guess what others would develop.

#### **Clarifying Mission**

25. Ron: all scenarios have to protect ESA; show risks and tradeoffs and issues; depict which tools are better. What we know and don't know.
26. Bruce: We have been working with NNG to package their tools for our purposes.
27. Pete C: the degree of protection afforded by each of our scenarios will depend on the rules and criteria we apply to each. Each scenario will have its own range of protection depending on the degree rules are applied.
28. Elise: NoName should provide scenario concepts for water supply and water quality. Determine how both work together. Each scenario can vary with not only rules, but tools applied.
29. Mike T: NNG should be directed to determine potential ws and wq benefits.
30. Ron: we will give these rules to NNG tomorrow.
31. Elise: NNG needs an incentive to produce products.
32. Curtis: there are infinite ways to deal with DEFT tools - NNG needs to evaluate these.